

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 8, 9 and 17-22 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 8 are amended. Claims 3, 4, 10 and 11 are canceled. Support for the amendments may be found in at least Fig. 5 and page 15, line 15-page 16, line 19 of the specification. No new matter is added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims at least in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1-4, 8-11 and 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,752,716 (Nishimura) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,300,936 (Braun), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,959,613 (Rosenberg '613) and U.S. Patent No. 6,147,674 (Rosenberg '674). As claims 3, 4, 10 and 11 are canceled, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 2, 8, 9 and 17-22, for at least the following two reasons.

First, Nishimura, Braun, Rosenberg '613 and Rosenberg '674, either alone or in any combination, fail to disclose or to have rendered obvious "when a plurality of the vibration occurrence simulation states occur simultaneously as conditions that cause the vibration mechanism to vibrate, the vibration mechanism control section selects a single simulation state among the plurality of simulation states based on degrees of priority assigned to each of the plurality of simulation states," as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 8.

The Office Action admits that Nishimura fails to disclose controlling the vibration mechanism in accordance with the degree of priority assigned to the simulation states when a plurality of the vibration occurrence simulation states occur simultaneously. Thus, Nishimura also fails to disclose the above feature, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 8.

Braun fails to make up for the deficiency of Nishumura. Braun discloses that when a device is determining output forces based on effects, the device checks if the effect is active, calculates the raw contribution to the output force of the effect, scales the force, and adds the

scaled contribution to the total sum of forces contributed by all the effects currently being output (column 22, lines 35-60). Braun also discloses that in determining the total sum, the device preferably combines all constant forces and limits the constant force sum to a predetermined magnitude, then combines all dynamic forces and limits the dynamic force sum to a predetermined magnitude...the two sums are then added together (column 22, lines 52-60). Thus, Braun discloses the process to determine the output forces based on the effects.

However, Braun fails to disclose selecting a single effect (i.e., simulation state) among a plurality of effects (i.e., simulation states). Further, Braun even fails to disclose assigning the degree of priority to each of the effects (i.e., simulation states). Thus, Braun fails to disclose the above feature, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 8.

Rosenberg '613 fails to make up for the deficiency of Nishimura and Braun. Rosenberg '613 discloses the process to modify or shape an initial source wave into a steady state force. Rosenberg '613 discloses that by adding control parameters and impulse parameters, the source wave is modified or shaped to the steady state force (column 16, lines 45-65). However, Rosenberg '613 fails to disclose selecting a single initial source wave (i.e., simulation state) among a plurality of the initial source waves (simulation states). Further, Braun even fails to disclose assigning the degree of priority to each of the initial source waves (simulation states). Thus, Braun fails to disclose the above feature, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 8.

Further, Rosenberg '674 fails to make up for the deficiency of Nishimura, Braun and Rosenberg '613. Thus, Nishimura, Braun, Rosenberg '613 and Rosenberg '674, either alone or in any combination, fail to disclose or to have rendered obvious the above feature, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 8.

Second, as Nishimura, Braun, Rosenberg '613 and Rosenberg '674 fail to disclose or to have rendered obvious selecting a single simulation state among the plurality of simulation

states based on degrees of priority assigned to each of the plurality of simulation states, as recited in claims 1 and 8, Nishimura, Braun, Rosenberg '613 and Rosenberg '674 also fail to disclose or to have rendered obvious "when a plurality of the vibration occurrence simulation states occur simultaneously as conditions that cause the vibration mechanism to vibrate, the vibration mechanism control section...controls the vibration mechanism in accordance with the set vibration content of the selected single simulation state," as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 8.

Thus, claims 1 and 8 are patentable over Nishimura, Braun, Rosenberg '613 and Rosenberg '674. Further, claims 2, 9 and 17-22 are patentable for at least the same reasons, as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Hirotsuna Yamashita
Registration No. L0563

JAO:HQY/emd

Attachments:

Request for Continued Examination
Petition for Extension for Time

Date: June 24, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry of this filing;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461